



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,629	07/03/2003	Deanna Lynn Quigg Brown	AUS920030412US1	7818
35525	7590	10/17/2008	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA)			HUSSAIN, TAUQIR	
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 802333			2452	
DALLAS, TX 75380				
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/17/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/614,629	Applicant(s) BROWN ET AL.
	Examiner TAUQIR HUSSAIN	Art Unit 2452

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal brief filed on 07/28/2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison et al. (Patent No.: US 7,249,191 B1), hereinafter "Hutchison" in view of Sato et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0041085 A1), hereinafter "Sato".
3. As to claim 1 , Hutchison discloses, receiving a request for host information for a remote computer from a requestor (Hutchison, Fig.7, Col.4, lines 16-21, where client 104 sends out a request to DNS) wherein the request includes one of a host name or an Internet Protocol address and is received from the requester (Hutchison, Fig.7, Col.4, lines 16-21, where client request includes an IP address);
identifying a media access control address and a subnet mask using the request (Hutchison, Fig.7, Col.4, lines 16-21, where client asking MAC address against an IP address and gateway responding with sending a MAC address means there is identifying means for identifying MAC address against an IP address); and
returning a response to the requester, wherein the response includes the media access control address (Hutchison, Fig.7, Col.4, lines 16-21, where gateway responds with MAC address, it is inherent that subnet mask will be there along with MAC address or else packet will be loss not knowing which network or which segment of the network it belongs to, further the MAC address has a corresponding IP address and IP address has its subnet mask to specify the sub network or network segmentation e.g. default subnet mask is 255.0.0.0 for Class A IP address and 255.255.0.0 for class B IP address and so on).

Hutchinson however is silent on disclosing explicitly, returning subnet mask.

Sato discloses, collecting subnet mask along with MAC address (Sato, Fig.4, [0017], where network parameter necessary for the managed device to communicate in the network requires e.g. IP address, a subnet mask and the MAC address to define the device among other things and any of these information can be used as needed for specific situation).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hutchinson with the teachings of Sato in order to provide a managed device, connected to a network and assigned network information that allows the managed device to communicate in the network, a management device, connected to the network and configured to manage the managed device based on the network information and to store the network information in an information recordable medium, and a drive unit configured to read the information recordable medium.

4. As to claim 8 and 15, In addition to the rejection of claim 1 above, Sato further defines the architecture where invention of claim 1 can be fully implemented as disclosed in Fig.2, elements 50a-50d are remote computers, interconnected via network interconnection devices 40a and 40b to an entrance server 30 and common server 70, further management device 10 is also connected to the same network via interconnecting device 40a and there is an administrative console attached to management device 10. It is further noted that claims 8 and 15 are merely an intended use for the setup and devices disclosed in claim 1 above.

5. As to claims 6,13 and 20, Hutchison and discloses the invention substantially as their parent claims 1,8 and 15, including, wherein the data processing system is a domain name server (Hutchison, Fig.7, Element-106, Col.4, lines 13-15, where DNS server returns the IP address for webpages.com).

6. Claims 2, 9 and 16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison and Sato in view of Bullman et al. (Pub. No.: Us 2002/0162038 A1), hereinafter "Bullman".

7. As to claims 2, 9 and 16, Hutchison and Sato discloses the invention substantially as in parent claims 1, 8 and 15, including, wherein the requester generates a packet using the host information and sends the packet to the remote computer (Hutchison, Col.4, lines 16-21). However, Hutchison is silent on using wake-up packet. Bullman however, teaches, generating a wake-up packet and transmitting it to remote computer to wake-up all the sleeping component of the computer (Bullman, [0017, lines 1-12]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison and Sato as applied to claim 1, 8 and 15 above with the teachings of Bullman in order to an obvious advantage to reuse existing well-defined network components such a MAC devices and drivers from a technical reuse and from cost perspective to consume less power while devices are not in use for long time.

8. Claims 3, 7, 10, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison and Sato as applied to claim 1, 8 and 15 above, in view of Harrison et al. (Pub. No.: US 2004/0177133 A1), hereinafter "Harrison".

9. As to claims 3, 10 and 17, Hutchison and Sato discloses the invention substantially as their parent claims, including, a DHCP server (Sato, [0109], where it is well known in the art that DHCP is capable of assigning IP, MAC and subnet mask).

Hutchison however is silent on disclosing explicitly, wherein the media access control address and the subnet mask are received from a dynamic host configuration protocol server and are stored in a data processing system for the data processing system.

However, Harrison teaches, wherein the media access control address and the subnet mask are received from a dynamic host configuration protocol server and are stored in the data processing system (Harrison, [0148], where DHCP keeps the updated SME database with the MAC and IP addresses of the CPE which upon terminal request forwards it to bridge DHCP Server). Examiner also takes the official notice that DHCP is a well known network device and can be used in all kind of network setup as the setup requirement and further MAC address has a corresponding IP address therefore, there is a subnet mask associated with it, and further DNS is the data processing system which stores all the records).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison and Sato with the

teachings of Harrison in order to patch up security holes in the network that could enable users from one class to access system that they are not authorized to access.

10. As to claims 7 and 14, Hutchison and Sato disclose the invention substantially as their parent claims 1 and 8.

Hutchison and Sato however are silent on disclosing explicitly, wherein the media access control address and the subnet mask are stored together in a record for both a name-to-address file and an address-to-name file.

However, Harrison teaches, wherein the media access control address and the subnet mask are stored together in a record for both a name-to-address file and an address-to-name file (Harrison, [0191, lines 1-7], where DNS is disclosed to carry out the mapping information from IP to MAC or MAC to IP and domain name to IP etc.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison with the teachings of Harrison in order to patch up security holes in the network that could enable users from one class to access system that they are not authorized to access.

11. Claims 4, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison and Sato as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15 above, in view of Matsuda et al. (Patent No.: US 7039688 B2), hereinafter "Matsuda".

12. As to claims 4, 11 and 18, Hutchison and Sato discloses the invention substantially as their parent claims 1, 8 and 15.

Hutchison and Sato are silent on disclosing explicitly, wherein the dynamic host configuration protocol server obtains the media access control address and the subnet mask from a remote computer when the remote computer requests an address from the dynamic host configuration protocol server.

However, Matsuda teaches, wherein the dynamic host configuration protocol server obtains the media access control address and the subnet mask from a remote computer when the remote computer requests an address from the dynamic host configuration protocol server (Matsuda, Fig.7, Element-704, Col.12, lines 46-52 and Col.12, lines 66-67 and Col.13, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison and Sato with the teachings of Matsuda in order to avoid conflict between home appliances in a home network and further to have the inventory listing of home appliances through DHCP table.

13. Claims 5, 12, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison as applied to claim 1,8 and 15 above, in view of Bahl (Patent No.: US 6,957,276 B1), hereinafter "Bahl".

14. As to claims 5, 12 and 19 Hutchison discloses, the invention substantially as in parent claims 1, 8 and 15.

Hutchison and Sato however are silent on disclosing explicitly, wherein the media access control address and the subnet are received from a user submitting the media

access control address and the subnet mask and are stored in a data processing system for the data processing system.

However, Bahl teaches, wherein the media access control address and the subnet are received from a user submitting the media access control address and the subnet mask and are stored in a data processing system for the data processing system (Bahl, Col.9, lines 1-9, where DHCP is a data processing system),

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Hutchison with the teachings of Bahl in order to reduce the broadcast on LAN by allowing DHCP server to issue a static IP address for infinite time (Bahl, Abstract).

15. As to claim 21, carries similar limitations and claim 1, 8 and 15 above and therefore is rejected for same rationale, additionally Bahl discloses, "media access control address and subnet mask for the remote computer using the request" (Bahl, Col.9, lines 1-9, where IP, subnet mask and MAC address is verified before assigning an IP address, since IP address, subnet mask to MAC address mapping is already stored in the database for identification or verification purposes therefore, it will be obvious to return the remote computer with its MAC address along with new IP address along with subnet mask).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAUQIR HUSSAIN whose telephone number is (571)270-1247. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571 272 3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. H. /
Examiner, Art Unit 2452

/Kenny S Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452
/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151